

Trump - Clinton

Presidential Campaign Debates: A Pragmatic Study

Shahad Abbas Saeed

Department of English Language - Open College of Education - Ministry of Education -Iraq

shahad93english@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 06 Sep
Accepted: 09 Nov
Volume: 3
Issue: 4

ABSTRACT

Political discourse is an important tool for politicians because it helps them present ideas in a persuasive and effective way. Among the different forms of political discourse, debates are considered one of the most powerful strategies during election campaigns, as they can strongly influence public opinion and shape people's beliefs. This study focused on a pragmatic analysis of the 2016 U.S. presidential campaign debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. The aim was to examine how language was used as a source of power in political life. To achieve this, the researcher used an eclectic model based on Grice's conversational maxims and Yule's types of presuppositions, applying them to ten selected excerpts from the first debate. The analysis sought to answer two main questions: (1) What role did Clinton's and Trump's use or violation of Grice's maxims play in their debate? (2) How did both candidates use presuppositions to manipulate language and deliver their messages effectively?

KEYWORDS: Political discourse, pragmatic, debate.

1 Introduction

Learning the abstract knowledge of intonation, phonology, syntax, and semantics of a language remains useless if the learners are not able to grasp what is meant behind an utterance. Accordingly, when learners understand the function of linguistic items, they can use language effectively and they can understand language in context. Here then, studying the invisible meaning and the way we recognize what is meant even when it is not actually said or written, the importance of pragmatics as a discipline in language teaching arises.

Fairclough (1988:10) considers that politicians' ability to gain power lies in their ability to convince the public that their ideas converge with those of the people. In this respect, studying political discourse from a pragmatic perspective reveals that politicians exploit language as a powerful tool to control people's mind and to achieve political ends. That's to say, "politicians manipulate language to win elections and to persuade voters that the ideas of their leaders coincide with their own perspectives and interests" (Schiffrin, Tannen and Hamilton, 2001:398).

Due to what is mentioned before, the researcher accomplishes Political debate as a subject of this study since it encompasses many pragmatic elements in political discourse. As such, the present study is a pragmatic analysis of the first presidential campaign debate which occur in America between Trump and Clinton in 2016. Thus, the research will examine the pragmatic features of the chosen debate in light of abiding or flouting Grice's maxims by the two candidates during their first parliamentary debate and the prominent type of presupposition triggers which are employed by Clinton and Trump, the two candidates for the American Presidential elections in 2016.

1.2 Research problem

1. What is the function of Clinton's and Trump's abiding by or flouting Grice's maxims in their debate?
2. How does Clinton's and Trump's exploitation of presuppositions in their debate aids both candidates in manipulating language and delivering an effective message?

1.3 Research hypotheses

1. The candidates employ the Grice's maxims during their speech. However, they flouting the manner maxims by being ambiguous during their speech.
2. Clinton and Trump exploit different types of presupposition in order to deliver an effective message.

1.4 Purpose for the Research Study

The purpose of the study is to emphasize the role of language specifically pragmatic features, played during Trump's and Clinton's delivering perspectives in their first presidential debate. By doing so, this study will draw attention to the power of pragmatic strategies have in influencing the consciousness, emotions, and feelings of the audience since politeness principle, representative speech acts, and Grice maxims have the power to persuade and to induce certain actions and thoughts (Bokayeva, 2013:3). Achieving such an aim is attained by following pragmatic notions such as Grice's maxims and presuppositions etc... In a word, this research aims to study how pragmatic strategies when followed by the candidates increase the credibility of the latter's assertion.

1.5 Significance of the Topic

The present study is of theoretical importance to learners of English as a foreign language since it highlights the importance of pragmatic competence which versus linguistic competence. Moreover, it draws on the tremendous influence that pragmatic strategies have in political debate as they can deliver indirectly important messages via language and its function. Besides, the study provides empirical evidence of the application of the pragmatic eclectic model of analysis.

1.6 Definition of Key Terms

1. **Pragmatics:** is the interaction between linguistics forms and the users of those forms in a social context and the understanding of the people's intended meaning or action that the speaker performs during his speech (Yule,1996: 4). According to Grice (1975) pragmatics is the intended meaning of the statement which is involved in conversational implicatures.
2. **Political discourse:** according to Chilton (2008: 226) political discourse is " the use of language to do political business, and includes persuasive rhetoric, the use of implied meanings, the use of euphemisms, the exclusion of references to undesirable reality, the use of language to arouse political emotions and the like"
3. **Debate:** formal or informal discussion between two participants about specific action (Chilton & Schaffner, 2002: 12)
4. **Presidential Campaign:** it is a struggle between two groups in an attempt to impose their power and ideas, or the competition between two candidates to improve their ideas in the way that affect the public's mind. (Lawrence, 1987: 159).

2. Review of Literature

This chapter sheds lights on the historical background of pragmatics, clarifies pragmatic triggers exploited in political discourse, and eventually highlights the function of debate in shaping society via words' power.

2.1 Introduction to Pragmatics

Although Pragmatics is a relatively new branch of Linguistics, research on it can be dated back to ancient Greece and Rome where the term Pragmaticus was found in late Latin and Pragmaticos in Greek and they both mean being practical. Modern use and current practice of Pragmatics is credited to Morris (1938) who distinguishes between syntax, as the formal relation of signs to one another; semantics, as the study of the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable, and pragmatics as the study of the relation of signs to interpreters.

Fasold (1990 :119) defined pragmatics as "the study of the use of context to make inferences about meaning". In this vein, inferences mean the conclusion which is reached by participants on the basis of available evidence. Birner (2013) believes that according to pragmatists, the precise meaning of a word is determined by the situation of the utterance. In other words, people do not always or even usually say what they mean. "Speakers frequently mean much more than their words actually say. For instance, there is one piece of pizza left can be understood as an offer 'would you like it?' or a warning ' it's mine' or a scolding ' you didn't finish your dinner' relying on the context, so people can say something quite different from what their explicit words mean, leaving the addressee figure out the intended meaning". (Birner, 2013: 1)

To sum up, definitions on Pragmatics have been widely generated but most converge in the fact that Pragmatics is all about the meanings between the lexis and the grammar and the phonology. Meanings are implied and the rules being followed are unspoken, unwritten ones. If we consider a sign seen in children's wear shop window: "Baby Sale- Lots of Bargains." We know without asking that there are no babies for sale and that what is for sale, are items used for babies. Kasper (1997) adds that the ability to comprehend and produce a communicative act is referred to as pragmatic competence which often includes one's knowledge about the social distance, social status between the speakers involved, the cultural knowledge such as politeness, and the linguistic knowledge, being the heart of pragmatics.

2.2 Pragmatic Notions

This section highlights the pragmatics theories upon which this study is based.

2.2.1 Cooperative principles

Along with speech act theory 'Austin 1962 and Searle 1969', Grice (1975) developed the cooperative principle. Grice suggested that any conversation needs cooperation between participants, due to the fact that the cooperation makes the conversation more meaningful and successful Principle. Grice (1975: 45) has defined the cooperative principle by his famous statement "make your conversation contribution as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged". In this respect, the speakers let the hearers assume the speaker's intention behind uttering a particular utterance. As such, the Cooperative Principle (CP) demands interlocutors to make their talk exchange understandable and suitable to the purpose of conversation. Grice, respectively, developed four categories of maxims. Those maxims account for the general standards governing verbal communication and make it possible to explain the meaning in a certain utterance.

According to Grice (1989: 273) maxims are four: quality, quantity, relation, and manner.

- Quantity
 - Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).
 - Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
- Quality: Try to make your contribution one that is true.
 - Do not say what you believe to be false.
 - Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
- Relation: Be relevant.
- Manner: Be perspicuous.
 - Avoid obscurity of expression.
 - Avoid ambiguity.
 - Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
 - Be orderly.

Thus, the simplest way to think of Grice's maxims is a set of general rules we follow in conversation. However, that is not entirely accurate. The interesting thing about these "rules" is that often, we 'do not follow them. By clearly and obviously violating a maxim, you can imply something beyond what you say, emphasizing thereby the urgent need of having the pragmatics' knowledge be attached to meaning. From here comes another important notion in pragmatics: abiding or flouting maxims.

2.2.2 Violation of Maxims

Grice (1989: 49) declared that "there are various ways in which maxims can be violated and reasons for failing to adhere to the maxims, namely inconspicuously violating a maxim, opting out from adherence to a maxim, choosing one maxim over another due to a clash of maxims, and blatantly flouting a maxim". Grice explains that in many utterances what is said is not equal to what is meant. He points out that implication can get across a great deal of meaning with relatively little actual speech. Thinking of what you want to get across and interpreting what other people have said, seems to take much quicker than the relatively slow process of actually verbalizing the necessary sound. Of course, it is not always for saving time because maxim violations are creative.

As such, Grundy (2008: 6) has proposed that "whenever a maxim is flouted there must be an implicature to save the utterance from simply appearing to be a faulty contribution to a conversation". In this vein, the

discourse yet meaningful by the capacity of implications since people still cooperative in their conversation even though the surface meaning of the talk is irrelevant and ambiguous in the sense that the hearer can work out to convey the implicit meaning.

To sum, there is an accepted way in the speaking which we all accept as standard behaviour. When we produce, or hear, an utterance we assume that it will be generally true, have the right amount of information, be relevant, and will be in understandable terms. However, sometimes people disobey the maxims for achieving specific purposes. Speakers violate maxims when they know that the hearer will only understand the surface meaning of the words. To illustrate, in the case of political discourse, "politician sometimes try to 'flout' the maxims and tend to be communicatively uncooperative" (Chilton & Scaffner, 2002: 11-12). This is due to the fact that politicians, at times, need to conceal their true intentions and address their public with a seemingly explicit agenda. By flouting maxims however, politicians veil covert strategies veil and many false postulates that they attempt to persuade their audience with.

2.2.3 Presupposition

Stalnaker (1973:447- 457) has introduced the theory of 'pragmatic presupposition' in which he puts a great emphasis on the context in order to interpret an utterance in respect to its truth and falsehood. In this concern, a speaker in a certain context presupposes a proposition pragmatically; that is to say, the speaker believes that the addressee recognizes this assumption. For example, if someone says ' the cat is on the mat' we propose that there is a cat and mat the recipient is indicating to. The context, in which the sentence is uttered, might be the pragmatic presupposition that the addresser is complaining about the cat's dirtying that mat .

Yule (1996:25) has defined pragmatic presupposition as "something the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance. Speakers, not sentences, have presuppositions". To illustrate, ' Marry's brother bought three horses' in this sentence the speaker recognizes that the addresser is expected to have a presupposition that a person is called Marry has a brother. Plus, the addresser may hold the more specific presupposition that Marry has only one brother and he has a lot of money. Thus, a presupposition is a series of assumption that speakers supposed to be appropriate background which is drawn from the context of discourse itself or from their commonplace knowledge which varies from one person to another. (ibid)

In general, presupposition refers to assumption implicitly made by interlocutors; these presuppositions are necessary for the correct interpretation of an utterance. In clear words, "what a speaker assumes is true or known by a listener can be described as presupposition" (Cruse, 2006: 138) .

As such, the focus of the researcher is how those pragmatic notions as Grice's maxims and presuppositions, are used in political discourse.

2.3 Political Discourse

The term political discourse has been investigated by different disciplines; however, the interest of this study is the linguistic aspect which enables politicians to use language in order to achieve certain aims. Politics, like all spheres of social activity, has its own code, a term used by linguists to refer to a language variety particular to a specific group Beard, (2000: 5). Of course, to grasp this code, a researcher should be aware of the pragmatic notion's politicians use to gain power, and this power cannot be gained unless politicians do succeed in persuading the public with their agenda and thus gain the latter's consent and support. De Wet (2010: 103) observes that "politicians rise to power mainly because they can talk persuasively to voters and political elites" Beard (2000:2) asserts that studying the language of politics can aid us in "understanding how language is used by those who wish to gain power, those who wish to exercise power and those who wish to keep power"

Chilton states that 'political discourse' has two types of broad stands, one considering it as the struggle for power between those who aim to achieve this power and the other who maintain to resist it.

According to linguists," language has a political dimension. Language is evolved to perform a social function; in return the social function is corresponding to what we understand as 'political'. In other words, language has power. As such, the political process doesn't exist without the use of language" (Chilton & Schaffner, 2002:23)

To conclude, there is a close relationship between language and politics. Since politics means power, politicians use the power of language to arouse the emotions of the audience as well as to affect their opinions and attitudes. For this reason, politicians sometimes tend to communicate in tricky, obscure, semantically intensive, indirect and rather careful manner.

2.4 American Presidential Campaign Elections

The most important event in American politics is the presidential election. Election can be defined as the choices people make by voting, the choice which receive the most votes is considered the winner. (Sobel, 2001:7)

Presidential elections have a significant effect on the American life since it provides a good chance for citizens' growth and education, protects people from their leader, as well as, they help forward the legitimate and stable government.

It is worthy to mention that presidential campaigns have an effect on the results of the election. The voters may be persuaded by the campaign's message and determine the candidate who deserves to lead their country; from here comes the candidate's need to exploit language in order to convince the audience.

2.5 The Effect of Debate on Political Campaign

It should be noticed that debate has a great influence on the voters' decision and the political campaign as well .

Ternt and Friedenberg (2008: 304-314) believe that political debate has the following impacts :

1. Attracts huge audience

Political debate attracts huge audience whether it occurs on local or state level, because it creates a sense of conflict and drama. To illustrate, in 1960 over one hundred million people in America watch at least part of the Kennedy- Nixon debate .

2. Reinforces Audience Opinion

Researchers point out that political debate tends to reinforce the attitudes of the citizens towards the candidates. For instance, in 1960 Kennedy and Nixon's supporters became more committed to their candidates after the debates.

3. Sharpens voters' knowledge of issues

Numerous studies find out that political debate sharpens voters' knowledge of the issues due to the fact that debate is beneficial to voters in local level since it is considered as significant source of information in these areas which receive a little media coverage. Voters become more knowledgeable as an outcome of watching debate because political debate set the agenda of the candidate and the people .

4. Enhances confidence in candidates and regime

In fact, studies have proved that the debates have great effect on the American institutions. Debates are consistent with democracy since they stress the importance of decision making by elections. Moreover, Eills& Fedrizzi (2011) argues that a debate supplies the audience with great amount of information about the candidates which results in particular involvement to the candidates' selection throughout the election process. Add to this, debate has a clear influence on people's confidence of government institution and stresses the positive role in political socialization .

To sum up, the political debate has an effective role on the audience in the sense that it entices a huge number of audiences and promotes the belief of audience members. Also, it helps to determine the political agenda and adds more knowledge to the voters as a consequence of watching debate. Furthermore, it boosts public confidence in the candidates and government with their proposed agenda.

Methodology

The present study is about qualitative and quantitative analysis of 2016 presidential campaign debates of the United States. First debate of the American Campaign election in 2016, specifically those which occur between Trump and Clinton, will be the corpus of data analysis. The collection data and transcriptions of the debate is available on the internet. The candidate Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton are from the Republican and Democrat parties.

3.1 Significance of the data

The American Campaign debate deserves the researchers' attention since it is considered the most prominent type of political discourse. Campaign debate views as a way for the public to know the candidates and their position; furthermore, it highlights the differences of their proposal policies.

The data of the present study are selected for it is the most important event in the 2016 which includes a special type of political debate occurs between two candidates from different gender.i.e. Trump and Clinton.

3.2 Instruments: Tools of Analysis

The researcher aims at identifying how the candidates use the function of language to get particular aims. The analysis of the chosen texts is carried out according to the eclectic model developed by this study:

3.2.1 Cooperative Principle

Grice has stated that the participants in any talk exchanges try to be cooperative in order to make their contribution such as required by the accepted purpose of conversation. For this reason, participants abide by four cooperative maxims which are: maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. By applying cooperative principle, the speaker allows the hearer to draw the assumption about the speaker's intentions and the contextual meaning .

However, speakers, to some extent, do not follow these maxims in their conversation. According to Grice (1975: 49) speakers violate the maxims when they fail to fulfill the maxims. He argues that the cooperative principle still to be functioning, even though the maxims are flouted.

3.2.2 Presupposition

According to Chilton (2008:64) presupposition can be linked to politics for its contribution to build the consensual reality. Presupposition in political discourse is used mainly for persuasion, among other uses, as the context allows the presupposition to go through the whole sentence unblocked .

According to Yule (1996:27) presupposition has been linked with numbers of words, phrases, and structures. He explains that these linguistic forms can be treated to be indicators of potential presupposition that become actual presupposition in context with speakers. As such, Yule mentions six types of presupposition; these types are:

1.**The existential presupposition:** this kind of presupposition can be presented in either the possessive construction 'e.g your car'. i.e. it is presupposed that you have a car. Or in any definite noun phrase for example the king of Sweden, the flower...etc .

Using this type, the speaker presupposes the existence of the entities named .

2.**The factive presupposition:** this type is called factive because some words are used in order to denote fact like ' aware, odd, glad, regret, realize, and know. When someone says 'everybody knows that . Mariam is clever' presuppose that Mariam is clever

The non-factive presupposition: the presupposition in this type assumes not to be true. Mentioning the verbs like ' pretend, dream, and imagine' mean that the information after them is not true ' e.g. John dreamed that he was rich' presuppose that John was not rich .

3.**The lexical presupposition:** some forms can be considered as the source of lexical presupposition as in manage, stop, and start. In this type, the use of one form with its asserted meaning is conventionally interpreted with the presupposition that another non asserted meaning is understood .

4.**The structural presupposition:** this type is associated with the structures of the sentence which have been analyzed as conventionally presupposing that part of the structure is assumed to be true. It is supposed that the interlocutor employs this type of presupposition to consider the information as true, consequently make the hearer accept it as being true. It can be present in Wh-question like ' when, where, what.etc ' to illustrate 'what did John read?' it is presupposed that John read something .

5.**The counter-factual presupposition:** this means that the presupposition is not true or it is contrary to the fact. For example, when someone says ' If you were his friend you would have helped him' the presupposition here is that you are not his friend. Thus, the conditional structure presupposes that the proposition is not true at the time of utterance.

Data Analysis

This chapter presents the findings of the study based on the data collected from the debates of the presidential campaigns that occurred between Trump and Clinton. The extracted data are presented in descriptive tables and the research questions are answered in the light of the findings.

Excerpt 1: Clinton "The central question in this election is really what kind of country we want to be and what kind of future we'll build together. Today is my granddaughter's second birthday, so I think about this a lot. First, we have to build an economy that works for everyone, not just those at the top. That means we need new jobs, good jobs, with rising incomes"

Grice's maxims

1. The quantity maxim: the speaker obeys the quantity maxim by being informative; Clinton talks about the processes of the future to achieve a great country .
2. The Quality maxim: Clinton abides by this maxim in the sense that she appears so confident about her intention to build a great country .
3. The Relation maxim: it seems that she flouts the relation maxim because she talks about the great future of the country that she wants to achieve, then she mentions her granddaughter's birthday .
4. The Manner maxim: Clinton flouts the manner maxim since she is somehow obscure. She tells the audiences indirectly that she thinks about the future of their country by mentioning her granddaughter's birthday.

Presupposition

Structural presupposition is used by the speaker; she states" what kind of country we want to be and what kind of future we'll build together." This type of presupposition can lead the addressers to conventionally interpret that the information is already known to be true .

Excerpt 2: Trump" Our jobs are fleeing the country. They're going to Mexico. They're going to many other countries. You look at what China is doing to our country in terms of making our product. They're devaluing their currency; and there's nobody in our government to fight them ".

Grice's maxims

1. The quantity maxim: Trump talks about one thing which is jobs. He informs the audience that other countries exploit their trade and product .
2. The quality maxim: Trump without evidence states that China devalues the product currency, so he flouts this maxim by being unsure .
3. The relation maxim: He violates the relevance maxim; he talks about the way that American's trade is exploited, and then he shifts to criticize politicians .
4. The manner maxim: the speaker violates the manner maxim for he is not being brief and ambiguity characterizes his words. He mentions "there's nobody in our government to fight them.", as if he indirectly refers to Clinton since she is a member of government.

Presupposition

In this speech, existential presupposition is used by which the speaker presupposes the existence of the entity's names. In other words, "our jobs are fleeing" make the other presuppose that the jobs of their country are in danger.

Excerpt (3): Clinton "I want us to invest in you. I want us to invest in your future. That means jobs in infrastructure, in advanced manufacturing, innovation and technology, clean, renewable energy, and small business, because most of the new jobs will come from small business. We also have to make the economy fairer. That starts with raising the national minimum wage and also guarantee, finally, equal pay for women's work "

Grice's Maxims

1. The quantity maxim: Clinton is as informative as required .

2. The quality maxim: it seems that the speaker is sure of her ability to renew the economy of the country in the way that coincided with people's interest .
3. The relation maxim: Clinton is relevant since she sticks to the point of regenerating the economy of the United States for achieving a better life .
4. The manner maxim: she abides the manner maxim by being clear and orderly .

Presupposition

Existential presupposition is used in this speech. The audiences already have a general background about the nature of the economy and business in America, so they presuppose what Clinton talks about and her assertion for making the economy in line with people's interest .

Excerpt (4): Trump " Under my plan, I'll be reducing taxes tremendously, from 35 percent to 15 percent for companies, small and big businesses. That's going to be a job creator like we haven't seen since Ronald Reagan "

Grice's maxims

1. The quantity maxim: Trump's contribution is informative. He gives the audience information about his plan .
2. The quality maxim: Trump is certain that cutting on taxes will bring benefit to everyone, as well as, he is confident that his plan will be as great as Ronald Reagan .
3. The relation maxim: the speaker is relevant enough in delivering his message. He talks about his policy and his plan for creating jobs .
4. The Manner Maxim: he abides by the manner maxim .

Presupposition

Trump employs Existential presupposition in this quote. The researcher's evidence is the use of possessive pronoun "my plan ."

Excerpt (5): Clinton "You have to judge us, who can shoulder the immense, awesome responsibilities of the presidency, who can put into action the plans that will make your life better. I hope that I will be able to earn your vote on November 8th ".

Grice's maxims

1. The quantity maxim: Clinton's contribution is informative. She directs the attention of the audience to choose the person who coincides with the interest of the country .
2. The quality maxim: Clinton is confident in talking about the right person who will improve the life of Americans; as if she indirectly refers to herself since she says "I hope that I will be able to earn your vote "
3. The relation maxim: Clinton abides the relation maxim since she sticks to only one subject which is the right person for American country .
4. The manner maxim: it seems that she violates this maxim in the sense that she indirectly refers to herself as a good person who deserve to be the president, requesting the voters to elect her .

Presupposition

Here, lexical presupposition is employed. The speaker uses the verb of judgment "I want you to judge us."

Excerpt (6) Trump " Secretary Clinton and others, politicians, should have been doing this for years, not right now, because of the fact that we've created a movement. They should have been doing this for years".

Grice's maxims

1. The quantity maxim: in this concern, the speaker appears more informative than is required; he mentions the same information more than one time
2. The quality maxim: Trump seems certain enough in his speech. He criticizes politicians for not doing what is appropriated for the country .
3. The relation maxim: Trump is relevant since he only concentrates on his attacking to politician .
4. The manner maxim: he violates this maxim due to the fact that he is not brief enough in delivering his message .

Presupposition

Structural presupposition is used due to the fact that speakers might use such structure to treat information as presupposed to be true and hence to be accepted as true by the listeners.i.e. "Secretary Clinton and others, politicians, should have been doing this for years, not right now "

Excerpt (7): Clinton: "What I have proposed would be paid for by raising taxes on the wealthy, because they have made all the gains in the economy and I think it's time that the wealthy and corporations pay their fair share to support this country "

Grice's maxims

1. The quantity maxim: Clinton's contribution is informative. She informs the audience that her plan will consecrate on taxing from the rich people for the sake of funding other properties in the country .
2. The quality maxim: it seems that Clinton flouts this maxim. She is not confident enough of what she has proposed by saying "I think it's time that the wealthy and corporations pay their fair share", in other words, she mentions something for future .
3. The relation maxim: the speaker obeys this maxim due to the fact that he sticks only to one subject which is taxing from wealthy people .
4. The manner maxim: in this vein, the speaker abides by this maxim .

Presupposition

The speaker uses structural presupposition to make the audience accept the information as if they are true, she employs the wh- cleft construction "What I have proposed would be paid for by raising taxes on the wealthy" to presuppose that the tax will be increased on the rich people .

Excerpt (8): Trump" Well, I'm really calling for major jobs, because the wealthy are going to create tremendous jobs. They are going to expand their companies, they're gonna do a tremendous job "

Grice's maxims

1. The quantity maxim: the speaker flouts this maxim since he is informative than is required, repeating the same idea "wealthy are going to create tremendous job ."
2. The quality maxim: Trump confidently talks about his plan which concentrates on the lowering tax of rich people because their companies will create more jobs in America .
3. The relation maxim: here, the speaker abides by this maxim by being relative to the main subject of conversation .
4. The manner maxim: the speaker violates this maxim. He tries to prolong his speech by using same words " gonna do a tremendous job ."

Presupposition

He uses factive presupposition to denote fact by using the word "really". Trump tries to make the audience presuppose what he has proposed as fact .

Excerpt (9): Clinton " We've got to do several things at the same time. We have to restore trust between communities and the police. We have to work to make sure that our police are using the best training, the best techniques, that they're well-prepared to use force only when necessary. Everyone should be respected by the law and everyone should respect the law. Right now, that's not the case in a lot of our neighborhoods "

Grice's maxims

1. The quantity maxim: here, Clinton tries to be as informative as required. She informs the audience that good relationship between the communities and the police, best techniques, and reducing the force, is a better solution for stopping crimes .
2. The quality maxim: the speaker is certain enough about her proposal since she states" Right now, that's not the case in a lot of our neighborhoods." This means that the neighborhoods are living in a state of instability because of the non- application of these aspects .
3. The relation maxim: in this vein, the speaker is not relative because she talks about the aspects which regarded as a solution for crimes, and then she shifts to give the audience information about the state of neighborhoods in the present time .
4. The manner maxim: she flouts this maxim due to not being orderly .

Presupposition

In this expert, factive presupposition is used by the speaker to express truth. As such, the information after "have to" is presupposed as being truth by the audience.

Excerpt (10): Trump Well, first of all, Secretary Clinton doesn't want to use a couple of words, and that's law and order. And we need law and order. If we don't have it, we're not going to have a country ".

Grice's maxims

1. The quantity maxim: he is abided by this maxim since his contribution is informative .
2. The quality maxim: Trump is confident that what is important for the country is law and order .
3. The relation maxim: He violates this maxim since he first criticizes Clinton for doesn't mention law and order in her proposal, and then asserts his idea about what is important for the country .
4. The manner maxim: he prolongs his speech by nearly repeating the same words .

Presupposition

Existential is used in this quote, he wants the audience presupposed the existence of 'law and order'

4.1 Results and Discussion

4.1.1 Analysis of Clinton's texts

A. Cooperative principle

Table Grice's maxims in Clinton's data

Grice's maxims	Abide maxims	Types of maxims	Quantity	Quality	relative	manner	total
		Frequency	5	4	3	2	5
		Percentage%	100	80	60	40	100%
	Flouted maxims	Types of maxims	Quantity	Quality	relative	manner	total
		Frequency	0	1	2	3	5
		Percentage%	0%	20%	40%	60%	100%

This table shows that Clinton obeys the cooperative maxims during her speeches. She appeals more to the quantity maxim in order to make her contribution well perceived by the hearer, as well as, the same table reflects the fact that Clinton sometimes fails to obey the cooperative maxims. The most exploited maxim in her speech is the manner maxim. This is because, she occasionally makes her speech long-winded or ambiguous.

B. Presupposition

Table 5 Presupposition in Clinton's data

Presupposition	Types	Existential	factive	Non-factive	lexical	structural	Counter-factive	total
	Frequency	1	1	0	1	2	0	5
	Percentage %	20%	20%	0%	20%	40%	0%	100 %

The above results reflect that there are only particular types of presuppositions used in Clinton's speech. She adheres more to the structural one rather than other types.

4.1.2 Analysis of Trump's texts

C. Cooperative Principle

Table 8 Grice's Maxims in Trump's Data

Grice's maxims	Abide maxims	Types of maxims	Quantity	quality	relative	manner	Total
		Frequency	3	4	3	1	5

		Percentage %	60%	80%	60%	20%	100%
	Flouted maxims	Types of maxims	Quantity	quality	relative	manner	Total
		Frequency	2	1	2	4	9
		Percentage %	40%	20%	40%	80%	100%

we can conclude that Trump appeals to conversational maxims throughout his communication. The quality maxim is highly abided by in comparison to other maxims. This is evident that Trump tries to base his contribution on factual information. The same result depicts the fact that Trump occasionally flouts Grice's maxims for intended goals. The most flouted maxim is the manner maxims (80%).

D. Presupposition

Table1 Presupposition in Trump's Data

Presupposition	Types	Existential	factive	Non-factive	lexical	structural	Counter-factive	Total
	Frequency	3	1	0	0	1	0	5
	Percentage %	60%	20%	0%	0%	20%	0%	100%

As far as the above analysis is concerned, Trump resorts more to the use of existential presupposition to presuppose the existence of someone or something.

5. Conclusion

In sum, after analyzing 10 excerpts chosen randomly from the first presidential campaign debate of America in 2016, it is evident that the candidates perform various acts through their political speeches. Language is exploited by politicians as a tool of power which enables them to change people's minds and gain their consent.

With respect to Grice's maxims, "what is the function of Clinton's and Trump's abiding by or flouting Grice's maxims in their debate", it can be well depicted that politicians need many alternatives to express their interest and achieve political power, as such they exploit language to conceal their hidden agendas and reveal what they want the public to believe whether it is true or not. Thus, they violate one or more than one maxim to get their purposes. For example, both Clinton and Trump were captured at instances in their debate where they flout the maxims by giving more information or predicting the upcoming issue without having evidence whether it will be true or not, or saying something irrelevant to the topic of discussion, or talking about ambiguous things. The quantity maxim was well abided by; however, the manner maxim was frequently flouted in their speech. To sum up the function of flouting maxims aid politicians in delivering ambiguous messages that cannot be validated with tangible evidence.

With respect to research question which stating "how does Trump's and Clinton's exploitation of presuppositions in their debates aid both candidates in manipulating language and delivering an effective message", the textual analysis of selected excerpts portray that the candidates make their intended presupposition through certain linguistic structures; they try to persuade their audience through the process of presupposition. As such, the results have shown that both of Clinton and Trump have employed different types of presupposition during their debate, to illustrate, Clinton appeals more to use structural presupposition to add more reliable to her speech and make the listener accepted as being true, however, Trump appeals more to the Existential presupposition to presuppose the existence of someone or something. Thus, language in political discourse is a tool exploited by politicians to persuade the audience to take action (as to vote for them in this case), and give a positive image of one's self that aid the leader in attaining the approval of the public. Eventually, and most critically via language, the public are made to accept false postulates as the only legitimate truth and to abide by the norms that the politicians impose. From here, the result of the study to assert Halliday (1977: 57) who considered language as a social semiotic system and, according to him, any act of communication represents choices from this system which, in turn, is functional tool since the language system does have certain aims to serve. This function influences the structure and the organization of the language at all levels. Consequently, language can change, construct, and reshape a

complete society and more broadly affect the world as a whole. Thus, the function of language as the most central aspect of it, or in other words what language does and how it does it is far more important than all other linguistic elements. The socio-cultural aspect of any country which is concerned with the issue of power depends heavily on the ability to manipulate language.

On the other hand, Fair Clough (1988: 123) considered that language is a social construction, and as it is evidently depicted in the debate, both candidates exploited language to win the elections and to manipulate public's opinion and that it is language that creates power; through the power of discourse that society is constructed. A close examination on how language used in Trump's and Clinton's political debate is clear how language is a tool that can persuade the audience with a certain predetermined perspective. The ultimate weapon to manipulate the audience's minds remains the command of language, and it is via this command that politicians achieve power. De Wet (2010: 103) observes that "politicians rise to power mainly because they can talk persuasively to voters and political elites"

Beard (2000: 2) asserts that studying the language of politics can aid us in "understanding how language is used by those who wish to gain power, those who wish to exercise power and those who wish to keep power" Consequently, the deployment of language becomes a tool for creating and marketing an ideology predetermined by the speaker, and it is through analyzing the language of a politician that a great deal of the former's ideology can be perceived. As a matter of fact, Beard (2000: 53) renders that "making speeches is a vital part of the politician's role in announcing policy and in persuading people to agree with it". In line with this, the use of language was functional in Trump's and Clinton's debate in assisting each speaker in conveying the message he or she wants to portray, and concealing covert intentions behind well manipulated pragmatic strategies.

References

- Beard, A. (2000). The Language of Politics. London: Routledge
- Birner, B. (2013). Introduction To pragmatics. United Kingdom: Willy- Blackwell
- Bokayeva, A.N. (2013). Rhetorical devices of politicians. Revista de linguistic y lenguas Aplicadas vol 8, 59-65. Retrieved from <http://enu.kz/repository>
- Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C. (2002). Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Chilton, P. (2008). A pragmatics Analysis of Political Speeches. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press
- Cruse, A. (2006). A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press Ltd.
- De Wet, J.C. (2010). The Art of Persuasive Communication- A Process. Claremont: Juta & Company Ltd.
- Eills, R. and Feddrizi, M. (2011). Debate: Students' Edition. United states of America: South- Westren, Cengage learning
- Fairclough, N. (1988). Language and Power, 258. London: Longman
- Fasold, R. (1990). The Sociolinguistics of Language. Oxford: Blackwell publishers Ltd.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole and J. Morgan. Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press.
- Grundy, P. (2008). Doing Pragmatics. Great Britain: Routledge
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1977). Text as Semantic Choice in Social Context. Linguistic studies of text and discourse. Vol 2. pp 23-81.
- Kasper, G. (1997). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. Studies in second language acquisition. Vol 18, 149-169.
- Lawrence, N. (1987). The co-constitution of politeness implicature in conversation. Griffith University, Nathan, QLD 4111, Australia. Retrieved on May 30, 2013, from <http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/16083/39621.pdf?sequence=1>
- Morris, M. (2004). Network epidemiology: A handbook for survey design and data collection. 163. Oxford University Press.
- Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. & Hamilton, H. (2001). The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. USA: Black Well publisher Ltd

- Sobel, S. (2001). Presidential Elections: And Other Cool Facts. New York: Barron's Educational Series
- Trent, J.& Friedenberg, R. (2008). Political Campaign Communication: Principles and Practices. The United States of America: Roman & Littlefield, Inc.
- Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.

